



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sia, into the nineteenth century. Even in the American Revolution, gross violation of the ethics of civilized warfare may be charged to both sides, and our pioneer history is full of instances in which unprovoked torture and murder characterized our dealings with the Indians. All facts considered, it is scarcely necessary to plead for the Indian, his position in the stone age, separated from ourselves by thousands of years of the natural process of evolution.

A. L. BENEDICT.

BUFFALO.

DISCUSSIONS.

A FURTHER REPLY TO MR. J. M. ROBERTSON.

MY rejoinder to Mr. Robertson's "Reply" in the July number will be very brief. In his paragraph I. on p. 506, Mr. Robertson argues that because, borrowing for once a word I have seen used more than once in writings of his own, I spoke of a "blatant" faction, I therefore was "vituperating" a number of persons whom he names—persons for many of whom I have the greatest respect, based on a knowledge of their works and in some cases of themselves. His argument is doubly fallacious. (1) It does not follow that what may be predicated of a collective whole can be predicated of every individual who in any sense belongs to that whole. If an historian of recent events were to record that "London rejoiced in the boisterous fashion of 'Merry England' over the relief of heroic Mafeking," he would not necessarily be asserting that Mr. John M. Robertson had so rejoiced. Mr. Robertson has supplied me with a good specimen of the fallacy of Division, for which I should be duly grateful as a Professor of Logic (not of Moral Philosophy, as he says on p. 510—inaccurate in a matter which is irrelevant to the discussion, but on which verification would not have taken much trouble). (2) To refer only to responsible politicians whose views are sufficiently known—Mr. Morley and Mr. Bryce have accepted the annexation of the South African republics as now inevitable and they, with the great mass of the Liberal party, do not therefore belong to the *small* but very

Vol. XII—No. 1

noisy faction of which I was speaking—the people who keep calling out “Stop the war”—on Mr. Kruger’s terms, regardless of the interests of British subjects, and who pass resolutions against annexation and circulate petitions calling for *foreign* arbitration, as if there was a question in dispute between sovereign international states not yet at war. Perhaps it was a little unkind to the memory of the “Copperheads,” whose case had a certain plausible legality, to liken them to these people.

If anyone will carefully compare what Mr. Robertson says in paragraph 2 on p. 506 with what he said on p. 286 and with what I said in the second paragraph on p. 498, he will see that Mr. Robertson has produced no scrap of evidence for his statement that I “repeatedly insinuated” a “chronological measure” of personal authority—a measure which he ridicules by an incongruous analogy. He now says that I have not ventured explicitly to say I did not do this. I did explicitly say on p. 498 (l. 9 and 8 from foot of page) that what I actually wrote about my reasons for preferring the authority of Sir Alfred (now Lord) Milner to that of his assailants had nothing whatever to do with length of residence. Mr. Robertson reiterates his original assertion (with the omission of the word “repeatedly”) without being able to cite a single sentence of mine in support of his assertion, and then accuses me of “subterfuge.” Mr. Robertson’s criticisms of myself are, indeed, quite unimportant, except as illustrating what he apparently considers to be a fair method of controversy in matters where accuracy is easily obtained. On the more difficult problems of history and ethics further discussion with Mr. Robertson would, I think, be quite unprofitable. After reading his two papers of criticism I have re-read what I wrote in the January and in the July numbers, and I see nothing in my arguments that I should wish to alter—except that my statement of views is perhaps too condensed and that I have trusted too much to every word being read. On p. 405 the footnotes have unfortunately been transposed by the printer. To the books named in the footnote to p. 496 I should now like to add Mr. E. T. Cook’s “Rights and Wrongs of the Transvaal War,” which contains a valuable collection of documents.

D. G. RITCHIE.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.